



U.S. Department of Justice

Immigration and Naturalization Service

burntying data deleted to prevent clearly unwarranted OFFICE OF ADMINISTRATIVE APPEALS 425 Eye Street N.W. ULLB, 3rd Floor Washington, D.C. 20536

File:

Office: VERMONT SERVICE CENTER

Date:

JAN 22 2002

IN RE: Petitioner:

Beneficiary:

Petition:

Petition for Alien Fiance(e) Pursuant to Section 101(a)(15)(K) of the Immigration and

Nationality Act, 8 U.S.C. 1101(a)(15)(K)

IN BEHALF OF PETITIONER: SELF-REPRESENTED

INSTRUCTIONS:

This is the decision in your case. All documents have been returned to the office which originally decided your case. Any further inquiry must be made to that office.

If you believe the law was inappropriately applied or the analysis used in reaching the decision was inconsistent with the information provided or with precedent decisions, you may file a motion to reconsider. Such a motion must state the reasons for reconsideration and be supported by any pertinent precedent decisions. Any motion to reconsider must be filed within 30 days of the decision that the motion seeks to reconsider, as required under 8 C.F.R. 103.5(a)(1)(i).

If you have new or additional information which you wish to have considered, you may file a motion to reopen. Such a motion must state the new facts to be proved at the reopened proceeding and be supported by affidavits or other documentary evidence. Any motion to reopen must be filed within 30 days of the decision that the motion seeks to reopen, except that failure to file before this period expires may be excused in the discretion of the Service where it is demonstrated that the delay was reasonable and beyond the control of the applicant or petitioner. Id.

Any motion must be filed with the office which originally decided your case along with a fee of \$110 as required under 8 C.F.R. 103.7.

> FOR THE ASSOCIATE COMMISSIONER, **EXAMINATIONS**

Robert P. Wiemann, Director Administrative Appeals Office **DISCUSSION:** The nonimmigrant visa petition was denied by the Director, Vermont Service Center, and is now before the Associate Commissioner for Examinations on appeal. The appeal will be dismissed.

The petitioner is a naturalized citizen of the United States who seeks to classify the beneficiary, a native and citizen of the Colombia, as the fiance(e) of a United States citizen pursuant to section 101(a)(15)(K) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (the Act), 8 U.S.C. 1101(a)(15)(K).

The director denied the petition after determining that the petitioner and the beneficiary had not personally met within two years before the date of filing the petition, as required by section 214(d) of the Act. In reaching this conclusion, the director found that the petitioner's failure to comply with the statutory requirement was not the result of extreme hardship to the petitioner, or unique circumstances.

Section 101(a)(15)(K) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (the Act), 8 U.S.C. 1101(a)(15)(K), defines "fiance(e)" as:

An alien who is the fiancee or fiance of a citizen of the United States and who seeks to enter the United States solely to conclude a valid marriage with the petitioner within ninety days after entry....

Section 214(d) of the Act, 8 U.S.C. 1184(d) states in pertinent part that a fiancee petition:

shall be approved only after satisfactory evidence is submitted by the petitioner to establish that the parties have previously met in person within two years before the date of filing the petition, have a bonafide intention to marry, and are legally able and actually willing to conclude a valid marriage in the United States within a period of ninety days after the alien's arrival...[emphasis added]

The Petition for Alien Fiance(e) (Form I-129F) was filed with the Service on March 21, 2001. Therefore, the petitioner and the beneficiary were required to have met during the period that began on March 21, 1999 and ended on March 21, 2001.

With the initial filing of the petition, the petitioner submitted photographs of the parties. However, the photographs were undated and did not establish that the parties had met within the required two-year period of time. The petitioner was therefore requested to submit additional evidence. In response, he submitted a letter stating that he and the beneficiary had been living together for at least twenty-five years and had four children together. The petitioner made no claim that the required in-person meeting of the

parties within the two-year time frame had been met or that a requirement to do so would have resulted in extreme hardship to him. Accordingly, the petition was denied.

On appeal, the petitioner states that he feels the decision to deny his petition was unfair. He submits statements from two Colombian nationals who indicate that they have knowledge that the petitioner and beneficiary lived together for twenty-five years, have four children, and that the beneficiary and children receive economic support from the petitioner. The statements contain no claim that the petitioner and beneficiary met in person during the requisite two-year period prior to the filing of the petition.

Pursuant to 8 C.F.R. 214.2(k)(2), a director may exercise discretion and waive the requirement of a personal meeting between the two parties if it is established that compliance would:

- (1) Result in extreme hardship to the petitioner; or
- (2) Violate strict and long-established customs of the beneficiary's foreign culture or social practice.

The petitioner has failed to establish that he and the beneficiary have personally met within the time period specified in section 214(d) of the Act, and that extreme hardship or unique circumstances qualify him for a waiver of the statutory requirement. Pursuant to 8 C.F.R 214.2(k)(2), the denial of this petition is without prejudice to the filing of another I-129F in the future.

The burden of proof in these proceedings rests solely with the petitioner. Section 291 of the Act, 8 U.S.C. 1361. The petitioner has not met that burden.

ORDER: The appeal is dismissed.